

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 8, 29 and 41 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1, 3-15 and 17-42 are presented for examination.

Claims 8, 29, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that claims 8, 29 and 41 have been amended to appear in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 15, 17-29, and 31-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiessling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,901,251) in view of Proust et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,014). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Kiessling in view of Proust.

Kiessling discloses a mobile telephone capable of serving an external application, which is located in a remote device. Such an external application will communicate with the mobile telephone over a wireless link (i.e., radio, short-range supplementary data or infrared). The user will interact with the external application through the man-machine interface of the mobile telephone. See Kiessling at col. 5, ll. 32-40.

Proust discloses a data storage having a plurality of files. Each of these files is associated with a standard access control policy. This is defined by a plurality of standard access conditions (AC standard), each applying to a separate command that can access this file. See Proust at col. 11, ll. 14-18.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a controller to establish a wireless communication link between the wireless communication module and a first remote device

based upon access rights associated with the first remote device to the public storage area and the private storage area. Applicant submits that neither Kiessling nor Proust disclose or suggest basing establishment of a wireless communication link on access rights associated with a first remote device to a public storage area and a private storage area of a data storage module at a portable device.

Proust discloses associating files in data storage with standard access control policies. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of establishing a wireless communication link based upon such access control policies. Since neither Kiessling nor Proust disclose or suggest establishing a wireless communication link between a wireless communication module and a first remote device based upon access rights associated with the first remote device to a public storage area and a private storage area, any combination of Kiessling and Proust would disclose or suggest such a feature. As a result, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Kiessling in view of Proust.

Independent claims 15, 21 and 33 recite limitations similar to those in claim 1. Thus, claims 15, 21 and 33, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Kiessling in view of Proust for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 9, 13, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiessling et al., in view of Fifield (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,752). Claims 14, 16, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiessling et al., in view of well-known prior art. Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over any combination of Kiessling and Fifield since such combination would fail to disclose or suggest establishing a wireless communication link between a wireless communication

module and a first remote device based upon access rights associated with the first remote device to a public storage area and a private storage area.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.


Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 10, 2008



Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(303) 740-1980